

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,331	10/11/2001	Martti Heikkila	3952-36	8601
23117 75	590 12/28/2004		EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			ALVO, MARC S	
1100 N GLEBI	E ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8TH FLOOR			AKI ONII	TAI ER NOMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			1731	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	21
Advisory Action	09/913,331	HEIKKILA ET AL.	1+1
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steve Alvo	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	•	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:		,	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		,	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	$$ \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc	
10. Other:		Steve Alvo Primary Examiner	
		Art Unit: 1731	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/913,331

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not shown where the claimed language is disclosed. The portions of the specification which Applicant says supports the claimed limitations are more specific than the claimed terminology. Accordingl; y the 35 USC 112 rejections have not been overcome. Acceptable terminology was set forth by the Examiner in the first Office Action.